

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-19 stand rejected by this Office Action.

Other Amendments

Applicant is amending claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 to show a consecutive identification of the features. Applicant is also amending claims 1, 7, and 13 to replace “an ordered listing of additional components” with “an ordered listing of the additional components” because a proper antecedent basis is established.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-19 are rejected by the Office Action under U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US 4,937,743 (Rassman) in further view of US 5,208,765 (Turnbull).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of “identifying, from the plurality of components, a first component group containing additional components and a second component group containing optional components, **the additional components being required for an implementation of the system, the optional components being optional for the implementation of the system.**” (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the patent application as originally filed. For example, the specification discloses (Pages 16-18.):

Operation 14 of FIG. 1 includes indicia coding for effectively conveying which components of a system are required for implementation of technology using the web architecture framework, thereby affording a project definition and an implementation plan. See also FIG. 4. Operation 34 of FIG. 4 displays a pictorial representation of a system including a plurality of components, again, such as the pictorial representation shown in FIG. 21. Then the components are indicia coded in order to indicate required components for the implementation of the system. See operation 35. An example of such indicia coding is shown in FIG. 24. As shown, components of the web architecture framework without indicia coding indicate that such components are not required for implementation of technology using the web architecture framework. In contrast, Components of the web architecture framework with indicia coding represent components which are required for implementation of the technology. In the present description, such technology may relate to any sort of use of the web architecture, i.e. specific commerce implementations, etc.

However, the combination of Rassman and Turnbull fails to even suggest this feature. For example, Rassman merely identifies resources required to perform a medical procedure in fig. 1. If any of the resources is not available, the medical procedure cannot be performed. Similarly, in fig. 7, Rassman shows resources that are required to complete different phases of a project. Turnbull merely identifies requirements that are required to complete each stage as shown in fig. 1. Hence, the combination of Rassman and Turnbull fails to suggest the feature of “identifying, from the plurality of components, a first component group containing additional components and a second component group containing optional components, the additional components being required for an implementation of the system, the optional components being optional for the implementation of the system.”

Also, claim 1 includes the feature of “compiling, by the processor, an ordered listing of additional components for implementation into the existing system, the ordered listing providing an order that is **required** for installing the components in the web architecture framework.” The Office Action admits (Pages 5-6, section 4. Emphasis added.):

Rassman et al to specifically disclose an ordered list, the ordered listing providing an order that is required for installing the components in the web architecture framework, but does disclose the establishment of predetermined sequences, where it is necessary that one step be completed before the other as shown in col. 11, lines 19-24.

The Office Action alleges (Page 6, section 4.):

However, Turnbull discloses: an ordered listing providing an order that is required for installing the components in the web architecture framework...

Turnbull does disclose (Column 8, line 45 – column 9, line 14):

One embodiment of product control matrix 400 for the six stages illustrated in FIG. 4 is presented in FIGS. 7A, 7B and 7C. This embodiment is the most complex because both a new product design, a new fabrication technology, and a new package design are all under development. Product control matrix 400 provides a novel means for expeditiously integrating all operations and functions associated with this complex development. In this embodiment, design stage 401-1 is divided into ten requirements, which are:

- 1) Process Qualification I;
- 2) Design Review;
- 3) Characterization I;
- 4) Test Plan;
- 5) Die Package Submission;

- 6) Packing Design;
- 7) Product Control Team;
- 8) Statistical Process Management I;
- 9) Product Performance Plan I; and
- 10) Product Qualification I.

Requirements 404-1 in design stage 401-1 not only completely document the requirements of the product design stage 401-1 but also assure initiation of all operations necessary for a smooth transition from design stage 401-1 through alert control stage 401-6. Each of requirements 404-1 in design stage 401-1 is explained more completely below. **The requirements are described as they appear in product control matrix 400. However, the requirements are not listed in either sequential or chronological order within control matrix 400.** To the extent possible, the requirements are performed in parallel, but obviously, as described below, some requirements within a stage must be completed before initiation of other requirements within this stage. One important aspect of requirements 404-1 is that upon successful completion of requirements 404-1, all the basic work has been completed for initiation of requirements 404-2 in engineering samples stage 401-2.

As disclosed by Turnbull, the order of requirements (which are alleged to be “components” by the Office Action) in the requirements listing is merely in the order of product control matrix 400 (e.g., as shown in fig. 7a) and not in sequential or chronological order. The requirements listing does not provide an order that is required for completing a stage because the requirements listing is not in sequential or chronological order, and thus Turnbull implies another order is required to complete the stage. Moreover, some of the requirements may be performed in parallel. Although all the requirements in the requirements list need to be performed to complete the stage, Turnbull discloses that the ordering of requirements of product control matrix 400 is one possible ordering. Although Turnbull may disclose an ordered list of necessary requirements for completing a stage, the ordered list is not required for completing the stage.

Moreover, claim 1 includes the feature of “modifying, through the display adapter by the processor, the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being **indicia coded** in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase and that a proper functioning of the second set of components require an installation of the first set of components in the first phase.” (Emphasis added.) The Office Action alleges (Page 4, section 4.):

... modifying the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase/...modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase, (Col. 3, lines 10-11, [displaying resource utilization for the most recent data after data in resource database is updated], Col. 6, lines 20-22, lines 27-36, [shows secondary resources are displayed], Col. 14, lines 12-16 and Fig. 7, where the components [represented by resources] for the second phase are indicia coded by the rectangles labeled "Y" One for phase two)...

Rassman does disclose (Column 14, lines 9-27.):

FIG. 6 shows a display of a prospective schedule for the beginning of the month of June 1987 for Projects X and Y and Resources 123, 223 and 224. Project X has two phases which can be partially overlapping. Project Y has three phases none of which can overlap. Resources 123, and 223 are used in phases 1 and 2 of Project Y. Resource 224 is used twice during phase 1 of Project X and in phase 3 of Project Y.

FIG. 7 shows the dynamic or actual events as of June 8, 1987 with respect to the schedule shown in FIG. 6. Phase of Project X did not begin on time and ended late. The late ending is indicated by arrow t in the "phase one" cell. That delay has caused a conflict to arise because Resource 224 cannot be used concurrently in phase 1 of Project X and phase 3 of Project Y. This conflict is indicated by indicia C-6, C-7 and C-8. The time is indicated by a screen background color change. The interface between the two colors is the current time (t).

Rassman merely teaches indicia coding to indicate that a resource is used in a phase (e.g., resource 223 in "Y" Two and resource 224 in "Y" Three as shown fig. 6) and to indicate a resource conflict (e.g., indicia C-6, C-7 and C-8 as shown in fig. 7). However, Rassman fails to even suggest indicia coding to indicate that resource 223 must be installed in order for resource 224 to function properly, and consequently fails to suggest the feature of "modifying, through the display adapter by the processor, the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase and that a proper functioning of the second set of components require an installation of the first set of components in the first phase."

Applicant is similarly amending independent claim 7 to include the features of “a code segment that identifies, from the plurality of components, a first component group containing additional components and a second component group containing optional components, the additional components being required for an implementation of the system, the optional components being optional for the implementation of the system.” Claim 7 also includes the features of “a code segment that compiles an ordered listing of additional components for implementation into the existing system, the ordered listing providing an order that is required for installing the components in the web architecture framework” and “a code segment that modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase and that a proper functioning of the second set of components require an installation of the first set of components in the first phase.” Applicant is similarly amending independent claim 13 to include the feature of “logic for identifying, from the plurality of components, a first component group containing additional components and a second component group containing optional components, the additional components being required for an implementation of the system, the optional components being optional for the implementation of the system.” Claim 13 also includes the features of “logic for compiling an ordered listing of additional components for implementation into the existing system, the ordered listing providing an order that is required for installing the components in the web architecture framework” and “logic for modifying the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in a second phase and that a proper functioning of the second set of components require an installation of the first set of components in the first phase.” Thus, claims 7 and 13 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-19 ultimately depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-19.

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2006

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kenneth F. Smolik", written in dark ink.

Kenneth F. Smolik

Registration No. 44,344

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000

Chicago, IL 60606-7407

Telephone: 312-463-5419

Facsimile: 312-463-5001